

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 28 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICEIn re Application of: Payman Zarkesh-Ha,
et al.

) Group Art Unit: 2823

) Examiner: Su C. Kim

Serial No.: 10/764,803

) Atty. Docket No.: 02-5938

Filed: January 26, 2004

For: FIELD PROGRAMMABLE
PLATFORM ARRAYRESPONSE TO OFFICIAL ACTION
Restriction/Election RequirementHon. Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This response is presented to the Office Action mailed March 23, 2006, wherein the Examiner required restriction pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §121. Election is hereby made, *with traverse*, to prosecute Group I, i.e., method claims 1-8.

Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of the restriction is respectfully requested. Restriction is not required by 35 U.S.C. §121, as suggested in the Office Action. Congress wisely granted the *discretion* to restrict applications. According to 35 U.S.C. §121 "... the Commissioner *may* require the application to be restricted..." (emphasis added).

Furthermore, MPEP § 803 lists two criteria that must be present for restriction to be proper:

- 1) The inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed; and
- 2) There must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is required.

In searching the Group I claims, the class and subclass for the Group II claims will undoubtedly be searched, to ensure that no relevant art is overlooked. For this reason, there is no significant burden on the examiner, and certainly no serious burden as required by MPEP §121.